

Part 1: Propositional Logic

Literature (also for first-order logic)

Schöning: Logik für Informatiker, Spektrum

Fitting: First-Order Logic and Automated Theorem Proving, Springer

Part 1: Propositional Logic

Propositional logic

- logic of truth values
- decidable (but NP-complete)
- can be used to describe functions over a finite domain
- important for hardware applications (e.g., model checking)

1.1 Syntax

- propositional variables
- logical symbols
 - ⇒ Boolean combinations

Propositional Variables

Let Π be a set of **propositional variables**.

We use letters P, Q, R, S , to denote propositional variables.

Propositional Formulas

F_{Π} is the set of propositional formulas over Π defined as follows:

F, G, H	$::=$	\perp	(falsum)
		\top	(verum)
		$P, P \in \Pi$	(atomic formula)
		$\neg F$	(negation)
		$(F \wedge G)$	(conjunction)
		$(F \vee G)$	(disjunction)
		$(F \rightarrow G)$	(implication)
		$(F \leftrightarrow G)$	(equivalence)

Notational Conventions

- We omit brackets according to the following rules:

– $\neg > \wedge > \vee > \rightarrow > \leftrightarrow$ (binding precedences)

– \vee and \wedge are associative and commutative

1.2 Semantics

In **classical logic** (dating back to Aristoteles) there are “only” two truth values “true” and “false” which we shall denote, respectively, by 1 and 0.

There are **multi-valued logics** having more than two truth values.

Valuations

A propositional variable has no intrinsic meaning. The meaning of a propositional variable has to be defined by a valuation.

A Π -valuation is a map

$$\mathcal{A} : \Pi \rightarrow \{0, 1\}.$$

where $\{0, 1\}$ is the set of truth values.

Truth Value of a Formula in \mathcal{A}

Given a Π -valuation \mathcal{A} , the function $\mathcal{A}^* : \Sigma\text{-formulas} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is defined inductively over the structure of F as follows:

$$\mathcal{A}^*(\perp) = 0$$

$$\mathcal{A}^*(\top) = 1$$

$$\mathcal{A}^*(P) = \mathcal{A}(P)$$

$$\mathcal{A}^*(\neg F) = 1 - \mathcal{A}^*(F)$$

$$\mathcal{A}^*(F \rho G) = B_\rho(\mathcal{A}^*(F), \mathcal{A}^*(G))$$

with B_ρ the Boolean function associated with ρ

For simplicity, we write \mathcal{A} instead of \mathcal{A}^* .

Truth Value of a Formula in \mathcal{A}

Example: Let's evaluate the formula

$$(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (P \wedge Q \rightarrow R) \rightarrow (P \rightarrow R)$$

w.r.t. the valuation \mathcal{A} with

$$\mathcal{A}(P) = 1, \mathcal{A}(Q) = 0, \mathcal{A}(R) = 1$$

(On the blackboard)

1.3 Models, Validity, and Satisfiability

F is **valid** in \mathcal{A} (\mathcal{A} is a **model** of F ; F holds under \mathcal{A}):

$$\mathcal{A} \models F :\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{A}(F) = 1$$

F is **valid** (or is a **tautology**):

$$\models F :\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{A} \models F \text{ for all } \Pi\text{-valuations } \mathcal{A}$$

F is called **satisfiable** iff there exists an \mathcal{A} such that $\mathcal{A} \models F$.

Otherwise F is called **unsatisfiable** (or **contradictory**).

Example

$$F = (A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C)$$

A	B	C	$(A \vee C)$	$\neg C$	$(B \vee \neg C)$	$(A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C)$
0	0	0	0	1	1	0
0	0	1	1	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	1	1	0
0	1	1	1	0	1	1
1	0	0	1	1	1	1
1	0	1	1	0	0	0
1	1	0	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	0	1	1

Let $\mathcal{A} : \{P, Q, R\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ with $\mathcal{A}(P) = 0$, $\mathcal{A}(Q) = 1$, $\mathcal{A}(R) = 1$.

$$\mathcal{A} \models (A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C)$$

$$\mathcal{A} \models (A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C)$$

$$\mathcal{A} \models \{(A \vee C), (B \vee \neg C)\}$$

1.3 Models, Validity, and Satisfiability

Examples:

$F \rightarrow F$ and $F \vee \neg F$ are **valid** for all formulae F .

Obviously, every **valid** formula is also **satisfiable**

$F \wedge \neg F$ is **unsatisfiable**

The formula P is **satisfiable**, but not **valid**

Example

$$F = (A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C)$$

A	B	C	$(A \vee C)$	$\neg C$	$(B \vee \neg C)$	$(A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C)$
0	0	0	0	1	1	0
0	0	1	1	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	1	1	0
0	1	1	1	0	1	1
1	0	0	1	1	1	1
1	0	1	1	0	0	0
1	1	0	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	0	1	1

F is not valid:

$$\mathcal{A}_1(F) = 0 \text{ f\u00fcr } \mathcal{A}_1 : \{P, Q, R\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\} \text{ mit } \mathcal{A}(P) = \mathcal{A}(Q) = \mathcal{A}(R) = 0.$$

F is satisfiable:

$$\mathcal{A}_2(F) = 1 \text{ f\u00fcr } \mathcal{A} : \{P, Q, R\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\} \text{ mit } \mathcal{A}(P) = 0, \mathcal{A}(Q) = 1, \mathcal{A}(R) = 1.$$

Entailment and Equivalence

F entails (implies) G (or G is a consequence of F), written $F \models G$, if for all Π -valuations \mathcal{A} , whenever $\mathcal{A} \models F$ then $\mathcal{A} \models G$.

F and G are called **equivalent** if for all Π -valuations \mathcal{A} we have $\mathcal{A} \models F \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{A} \models G$.

Example

$$F = (A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C) \quad G = (A \vee B)$$

Check if $F \models G$

A	B	C	$(A \vee C)$	$(B \vee \neg C)$	$(A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C)$	$(A \vee B)$
0	0	0				
0	0	1				
0	1	0				
0	1	1				
1	0	0				
1	0	1				
1	1	0				
1	1	1				

Example

$$F = (A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C) \quad G = (A \vee B)$$

Check if $F \models G$

A	B	C	$(A \vee C)$	$(B \vee \neg C)$	$(A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C)$	$(A \vee B)$
0	0	0	0	1	0	0
0	0	1	1	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	1	0	1
0	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	0	0	1	1	1	1
1	0	1	1	0	0	1
1	1	0	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Example

$$F = (A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C) \quad G = (A \vee B)$$

Check if $F \models G$ Yes, $F \models G$

A	B	C	$(A \vee C)$	$(B \vee \neg C)$	$(A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C)$	$(A \vee B)$
0	0	1	1	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	0	0
0	1	1	1	1	1	1
0	1	0	0	1	0	1
1	0	1	1	0	0	1
1	0	0	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	0	1	1	1	1

Example

$$F = (A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C) \quad G = (A \vee B)$$

Check if $F \models G$ Yes, $F \models G$

... But it is not true that $G \models F$ (Notation: $G \not\models F$)

A	B	C	$(A \vee C)$	$(B \vee \neg C)$	$(A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee \neg C)$	$(A \vee B)$
0	0	1	1	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	0	0
0	1	1	1	1	1	1
0	1	0	0	1	0	1
1	0	1	1	0	0	1
1	0	0	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	0	1	1	1	1